

REMARKS

Claims 1-166 are pending in the present application. In summary of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 79, 157, and 162 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(e) as being allegedly indefinite and claims 1-166 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,247 (Lau) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696 (Lindhorst et al.) and in further view of alleged admitted prior art (APA) by Applicant.

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections to the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 79, 157, and 162 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Applicant has amended these claims to directly include material to address the issues raised by the rejection. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections for these claims is earnestly solicited.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-166 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,247 (Lau) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696 (Lindhorst et al.) in further view of alleged admitted prior art (APA) by Applicant.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant has amended the claim in addressing the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection adding that the application framework code is generated “if the application framework code is not available.” The Office Action does not address this language as being taught or suggested by any of the references cited by the Office Action. Applicant thus submits that all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., or alleged APA, or any combination thereof.

Also, the Office Action alleges that it was APA to “bind the compiled modified input files with the compiled web application source code at runtime.” The Office Actions refers to the background language of the patent application regarding interpretation of application code files at runtime. In particular, the background language states “all application files are later interpreted at runtime,” on page 3, lines 2-3. However, binding involves associating *input files* with *code* as claim 1 states “binding the compiled modified input files with the

compiled web application source code at runtime.” The portion of the background on which the Office Action relies does not mention input files or binding, just interpretation.

Thus, for the additional reason above, Applicant submits that all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., or alleged APA, or any combination thereof.

Regarding claim 2, the Office Action gives the same reason as for claim 1 in alleging that the “binding step” is described in alleged APA. Thus, Applicant submits that all the limitations of claim 2 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., alleged APA, or any combination thereof for the same reason shown above with respect to the “binding” step.

Regarding claim 3-166, they either depend from claim 1 or 2, or were rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 or 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all the limitations of claims 2-166 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., alleged APA, or any combination thereof, for the same reasons presented above.

“To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” MPEP § 2142. Since all the limitations of claims 1-166 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., alleged APA, or any combination thereof, as shown above, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for claims 1-166 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each point raised by the Examiner in the office action and Applicants submit that claims 1-166 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner’s earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

DOCKET NO.: IVGP-0002
Application No.: 09/810,716
Office Action Dated: July 7, 2004

Date: December 7, 2004

PATENT

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Jeremiah J. Baunach', is written over a horizontal line.

Jeremiah J. Baunach
Registration No. 44,527

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439